arXiv:1702.05434v1 [q-fin.TR] 17 Feb 2017

# The amazing power of dimensional analysis: Quantifying market impact*

Mathias Pohl† Alexander Ristig‡ Walter Schachermayer§
Ludovic Tangpi¶

February 20, 2017

**Abstract**. This note complements the inspiring work on dimensional analysis and market microstructure by Kyle and Obizhaeva [15]. Our main theorem shows by a similar argument as usually applied in physics the following remarkable fact. If the market impact of a meta-order only depends on four well-defined and financially meaningful variables, then – up to a constant – there is only one possible form of this dependence. In particular, the market impact is proportional to the square root of the size of the meta-order.

This theorem can be regarded as a special case of a more general result of Kyle and Obizhaeva. These authors consider five variables which might have an influence on the size of the market impact. In this case one finds a richer variety of functions which we precisely characterize. We also discuss the relation to classical arguments from physics, such as the period of a pendulum.

## 1. Introduction

Dimensional analysis is a well known argument in physics. The idea is best explained by considering the most classical example: the period of a pendulum.

The *basic assumption* is that the period depends *only* on the following quantities:

- the length $l$ of the pendulum, measured in meters,

*The authors acknowledge support by the Vienna Science and Technologie Fund (WWTF) through project MA14-008.

†University of Vienna, Faculty of Mathematics and Faculty of Business, Economics & Statistics, Oskar-Morgenstern-Platz 1, 1090 Vienna, Austria, mathias.pohl@univie.ac.at

‡University of Vienna, Faculty of Mathematics and Faculty of Business, Economics & Statistics, Oskar-Morgenstern-Platz 1, 1090 Vienna, Austria, alexander.ristig@univie.ac.at

§University of Vienna, Faculty of Mathematics, Oskar-Morgenstern-Platz 1, 1090 Vienna, Austria, walter.schachermayer@univie.ac.at

¶University of Vienna, Faculty of Mathematics, Oskar-Morgenstern-Platz 1, 1090 Vienna, Austria, ludovic.tangpi@univie.ac.at

- the mass $m$ of the pendulum, measured in grams,
- the acceleration $g$ of gravity, measured in meters per second squared.

Hence,

$$\text{period} = f(l, m, g), \tag{1}$$

where the period is measured in seconds and $f$ is an – a priori – arbitrary function.

Of course, the relation (1) should not depend on whether we measure length by meters or inches, time by seconds or minutes, and mass by grams or pounds. Combining these three requirements with the *ansatz*

$$f(l, m, g) = \text{const} \cdot l^{y_1} m^{y_2} g^{y_3}, \tag{2}$$

these requirements translate into three linear equations in the variables $y_1, y_2, y_3$. The unique solution yields the well-known relation (see [13] as well as Appendix A below for the details)

$$f(l, m, g) = \text{const} \cdot \sqrt{\frac{l}{g}}. \tag{3}$$

This result goes back as far as Galileo. The elementary linear algebra used in the above argument has been formalized in proper generality in the nineteenth century and is known under the name of "Pi-Theorem" (see Section 3 below).

Recently, Kyle and Obizhaeva [15] have applied this line of argument to analyze the *market impact* of a meta-order: think of an investor who wants to buy (or sell) a sizeable amount of an underlying stock within a limited time (e.g. two days). Of course, when placing this "meta-order" she will split it into smaller pieces, the actual orders, in some (hopefully) clever way. Nevertheless, we expect the quoted prices to move to the disadvantage of the agent. We call the size of this price movement the *market impact*.

We start by identifying the variables which we expect to have an influence on the size of the market impact:

- $Q$ the size of the meta-order, measured in units of shares $[\mathbb{S}]$,
- $P$ the price of the stock, measured in units of money $[\mathbb{U}]$,
- $V$ the traded volume of the stock, measured in the units of shares per time $[\mathbb{S}/\mathbb{T}]$,
- $\sigma^2$ the squared volatility of the stock, measured in percentage of the stock price per unit of time $[\mathbb{T}^{-1}]$.

Now we formulate the following basic assumption.

**Assumption 1.** *The market impact $G$ depends* only *on the above* 4 *variables, i.e.*

$$G = g(Q, P, V, \sigma^2), \tag{4}$$

*where the function $g : \mathbb{R}_+^4 \to \mathbb{R}_+$ as well as the quantity $G$ are invariant under changes of the units chosen to measure the "dimensions" $\mathbb{T}$, $\mathbb{U}$, $\mathbb{S}$.*

We note that $G$ is a percentage of the quoted price of the stock; hence it is a dimensionless quantity. We thus encounter an analogous situation as in the pendulum example. There is, however, a serious difference to the pleasant situation encountered above: we now have 4 variables, corresponding to the powers of $Q$, $P$, $V$, $\sigma^2$, but only 3 equations resulting from the scaling invariance for the fundamental dimensions $\mathbb{T}$, $\mathbb{U}$, $\mathbb{S}$. We need one more equation to obtain such a crisp result as in (3) above. Kyle and Obizhaeva found a remedy: an additional "no arbitrage" type argument which follows from the findings of the Modigliani-Miller theorem. We consider a stock which is a share of a company. Suppose that the company changes its capital structure by paying dividends or, passing to the opposite sign, by raising new capital. The Modigliani-Miller theorem precisely tells us which quantities *remain constant* when changing the leverage between equity and debt of the company. This requirement should furnish one more equation to be satisfied by (4). For the details we refer to Section 4 below. The subsequent assumption summarizes the additional restriction which Kyle and Obizhaeva call "leverage neutrality" (see Assumption 5 below for a more formal definition).

**Assumption 2** (Leverage Neutrality)**.** *The value of a firm does not depend on its capital structure, i.e. its debt-equity ratio.*

It turns out that this invariance indeed provides one more linear equation analogous to the equations obtained by the scaling arguments above. We therefore find ourselves in a perfectly analogous situation as with the pendulum and have the same number of equations as unknowns, namely four.

**Theorem 1.** *Under Assumptions 1 and 2, the market impact is of the form*

$$G = \text{const} \cdot \sigma \sqrt{\frac{Q}{V}}, \tag{5}$$

*for some constant* $\text{const} > 0$.

In particular, we find the square-root dependence on the order size $Q$ in accordance with several theoretical as well as empirical findings (see the review of the literature below).

In fact, the above line of arguments does not correspond exactly to what Kyle and Obizhaeva have done in [15] (compare also [16]). They were more ambitious and considered one more variable which may have influence on the market impact. These authors suppose that the agent faces a fixed "inventory cost" $C$ when preparing the placement of a meta-order. It is assumed to be independent of the order size $Q$ as well as of the quantities $P$, $V$, $\sigma^2$ discussed above. Hence, they consider an additional quantity which might have an influence on the market impact:

- $C$ the fixed inventory cost, measured in units of money $[\mathbb{U}]$.

In other words, Kyle and Obizhaeva only use the subsequent hypothesis which is weaker than Assumption 1 above.

**Assumption 3.** *The market impact $G$ depends only on the above 5 variables, i.e.*

$$G = g(Q, P, V, \sigma^2, C), \tag{6}$$

*where the function $g : \mathbb{R}_+^5 \to \mathbb{R}_+$ as well as the quantity $G$ are invariant under changes of the units chosen to measure the "dimensions" $\mathbb{T}, \mathbb{U}$ and $\mathbb{S}$.*

Starting from this weaker assumption Kyle and Obizhaeva apply a similar reasoning as above, in particular the argument of leverage neutrality. This leads to four linear equations in five unknowns. The solution is not unique anymore, but rather a 1-dimensional affine space in $\mathbb{R}^5$. In other words, we still have one degree of freedom left which leads to the following theorem.

**Theorem 2** (Kyle and Obizhaeva)**.** *Under Assumptions 2 and 3, the market impact is of the form*

$$G = \frac{1}{L} f(Z) \tag{7}$$

*where $f : \mathbb{R}_+ \to \mathbb{R}_+$ is an arbitrary function and the quantities $L$ and $Z$ are given by*

$$L = \left(\frac{PV}{\sigma^2 C}\right)^{1/3} \quad \text{and} \quad Z = \left(\frac{Q^3 P^2 \sigma^2}{V C^2}\right)^{1/3}. \tag{8}$$

A priori, the generality of the function $f : \mathbb{R}_+ \to \mathbb{R}_+$ is not restricted by Assumption 3. Specializing further as in the ansatz (2) above, one may consider $f$ to be of the form $f(z) = z^p$, for some $p \geq 0$, so that $G = \text{const} \cdot Z^p/L$. In this case, the choice $p = 1/2$ leads precisely to the relation (5) obtained in Theorem 1 above. Moreover, we would like to emphasize that the quantities $L$ and $Z$ have an intuitive and financially meaningful interpretation in terms of measuring liquidity and the size of meta-orders (see [15]).

The roadmap of this note is as follows. In Section 2, we provide a brief review of the existing literature. Section 3 introduces some notation as well as the so-called Pi-Theorem from dimensional analysis, which is the key to rigorously proving Theorems 1 and 2 in Section 4. Section 5 concludes. Appendix A applies dimensional analysis to the pendulum in more details and some proofs are moved to the Appendix B.

## 2. Literature review

As pointed out in recent reviews [5, 10], market impact can arise from different sources. For instance, Kyle derives from an agent-based model in his seminal paper [14] that market impact is linear in the order size and permanent in time. The majority of studies, however, does not support this conclusion of Kyle's model. Instead, a body of literature finds market impact being non-linear in the order size and fading in time, e.g. [5]. In particular, the market impact is frequently found to be concave in the size of the meta-order and in particular close to the square-root function, which causes the name *square-root law* for market impact, see [2, 3, 6, 9, 12, 17, 19, 21]. Among other results, a market microstructure foundation in favor of the square-root law is provided in [11]. The broad evidence for the square-root law relies on studies having data from different venues, maturities, historical periods and geographical areas and thus provides the square-root law with universality. On the other hand, it deserves to be mentioned that some studies reveal empirically substantial deviations from the square-root law, e.g. [1, 22].

Let us try to elaborate on the relation between dimensional analysis and general theory by alluding once more to the analogy with the period of the pendulum. Complementary to the introductory example, relation (3) from physics can also be derived from solving differential equations. Analogously, the square-root law for market impact can also be derived via solving partial differential equations, see Donier et al. [8, Section 5]. These

authors formulate the dynamics of the average buy and sell volume density of the *latent order book* in terms of partial differential equations under minimal model requirements. While the latent order book is a theoretical concept which records the trading intentions of market participants, traders typically do not display their true supply and demand, so that the fictitious, non-public latent order book differs from the observed limit order book. As we derive the square-root law for market impact via dimensional analysis, Theorem 1 complements the existing literature.

## 3. Some linear algebra

To review the basic results of dimensional analysis we follow Chapter 1 of the book by Bluman and Kumei [4]. Additionally, the interested reader is referred to [20] for a historical perspective and to [7] for a purely mathematical treatment of dimensional analysis. We formalize the assumptions behind dimensional analysis.

**Assumption 4** (Dimensional analysis)**.**

*(i) Let the quantity of interest $U \in \mathbb{R}_+$ depend on $n$ quantities $W_1, \dots, W_n \in \mathbb{R}_+$, i.e.*

$$U = H(W_1, W_2, \dots, W_n) \tag{9}$$

*for some function $H : \mathbb{R}_+^n \to \mathbb{R}_+$.*

*(ii) The quantities $U, W_1, \dots, W_n$ are measured in terms of $m$ fundamental dimensions labelled $L_1, \dots, L_m$. For any positive quantity $X$, its dimension $[X]$ satisfies $[X] = L_1^{x_1} \cdots L_m^{x_m}$ for some $x_1, \dots, x_m \in \mathbb{R}$. If $[X] = 1$, the quantity $X$ is called* dimensionless*.*

*The dimensions of the quantities $U, W_1, W_2, \dots, W_n$ are known and given in the form of the vectors $a$ and $b^{(i)} \in \mathbb{R}^m$, $i = 1, \dots, n$, satisfying $[U] = L_1^{a_1} \cdots L_m^{a_m}$ and $[W_i] = L_1^{b_{1i}} \cdots L_m^{b_{mi}}$, $i = 1, \dots, n$. Denote by $B = (b^{(1)}, b^{(2)}, \dots, b^{(n)})$ the $m \times n$ matrix with column vectors $b^{(i)} = (b_{1i}, \dots, b_{mi})^\top$, $i = 1, \dots, n$.*

*(iii) For the given set of fundamental dimensions $L_1, \dots, L_m$, a* system of units *is chosen in order to measure the value of a quantity. A change from one system of units to another amounts to rescaling all considered quantities. In particular, dimensionless quantities remain unchanged and formula* (9) *is invariant under arbitrary scaling of the fundamental dimensions.*

We can now state the main result from dimensional analysis (see [4]).

**Theorem 3** (Pi-Theorem)**.** *Under Assumption 4, let $x^{(i)} := (x_{1i}, \dots, x_{ni})^\top$, $i = 1, \dots, k := n - \operatorname{rank}(B)$, and $y := (y_1, \dots, y_n)^\top$ be solutions to the homogeneous and inhomogenous systems $Bx = 0$ and $By = a$ respectively. Then, there is a function $F : \mathbb{R}_+^k \to \mathbb{R}_+$ such that*

$$U = W_1^{y_1} \cdots W_n^{y_n} F(\pi_1, \dots, \pi_k), \tag{10}$$

*where $\pi_i := W_1^{x_{1i}} \cdots W_n^{x_{ni}}$ are dimensionless quantities, for $i = 1, \dots, k$.*

We shall only need the special cases $k = 0$ and $k = 1$, which are spelled out in the two subsequent corollaries.

**Corollary 4.** *Under Assumption 4, suppose that* $\operatorname{rank}(B) = n$ *and let* $y := (y_1, \dots, y_n)^\top$ *be the unique solution to the linear system* $By = a$*. Then there is a constant* $\text{const} > 0$ *such that*

$$U = \text{const} \cdot W_1^{y_1} \cdots W_n^{y_n}.$$

**Corollary 5.** *Under Assumption 4, suppose that* $\operatorname{rank}(B) = n - 1$ *and let* $x := (x_1, \dots, x_n)$ *and* $y := (y_1, \dots, y_n)^\top$ *be solutions to the homogeneous and inhomogeneous systems* $Bx = 0$ *and* $By = a$ *respectively. Then there is a function* $F : \mathbb{R}_+ \to \mathbb{R}_+$ *such that*

$$U = W_1^{y_1} \cdots W_n^{y_n} F(W_1^{x_1} \cdots W_n^{x_n}).$$

# 4. Market impact

The aim of this section is to formalize and prove Theorems 1 and 2 stated in the introduction by applying Corollaries 4 and 5. In order to derive the price impact function from these corollaries, we need to formalize Assumption 2 in the framework of Section 3. Therefore, we take a closer look at this assumption and hence, the behavior of the quantities $G, Q, P, V, \sigma^2$ and $C$ in case of leveraging the firm's debt-equity ratio. From a conceptual point of view, this gives an additional constraint on their behavior. This constraint can be understood as an additional "dimension" in our analysis, which we refer to as the "Modigliani-Miller-dimension" $\mathbb{M}$. Scaling $\mathbb{M}$ by a factor $A \neq 0$ is equivalent to leveraging with a factor $A$. Following [15], Assumption 2 can be reformulated in the following way:

**Assumption 5.** *Scaling* $\mathbb{M}$ *by a factor* $A$ *implies that*

- $Q$*,* $V$ *and* $C$ *remain constant,*
- $P$ *changes by a factor* $A^{-1}$*,*
- $\sigma^2$ *changes by a factor* $A^2$*,*
- $G$ *changes by a factor* $A$*.*

To recapitulate in prose: setting $A = 2$ corresponds to paying out half of the equity as dividends in the sense that each share yields a dividend of $(1 - A^{-1})P = P/2$. The stock price thus is multiplied by $1/2$ while the volatility $\sigma$ and the percentage price impact $G$ are multiplied by $A = 2$. The remaining quantities are not affected by changing the leverage, in accordance with the insight of Modigliani and Miller [18] and the recent work by Kyle and Obizheava [15]. As indicated in the introduction, this assumption is referred to as *leverage neutrality*.

We now formulate Theorem 1 from the introduction in terms of Assumption 5 and prove it:

**Theorem 6.** *Under Assumptions 1 and 5, the market impact is of the form*

$$G = \text{const} \cdot \sigma \sqrt{\frac{Q}{V}}, \tag{11}$$

*for some constant* $\text{const} > 0$*.*

| | $Q$ | $P$ | $V$ | $\sigma^2$ | $C$ | $G$ |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| $\mathbb{S}$ | 1 | -1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| $\mathbb{U}$ | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| $\mathbb{T}$ | 0 | 0 | -1 | -1 | 0 | 0 |
| $\mathbb{M}$ | 0 | -1 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 1 |

Table 1: A labelled overview of the matrix $B$ related to the dimensions of the quantities $(Q, P, V, \sigma^2)$ and the matrix $K$ related to the dimensions of the quantities $(Q, P, V, \sigma^2, C)$, respectively, as well as the vector $a$ related to the dimensions of $G$.

*Proof.* Combining Assumptions 1 and 5 with the dimensions of $Q, P, V$ and $\sigma^2$ introduced in Section 1, we obtain that the matrix $B$ and the vector $a$ are given by

$$B = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & -1 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & -1 & -1 \\ 0 & -1 & 0 & 2 \end{pmatrix} \quad \text{and} \quad a = \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 1 \end{pmatrix}. \tag{12}$$

Table 1 illustrates how $B$ and $a$ relate to the considered quantities and their dimensions. As the matrix $B$ has full rank, i.e. $\operatorname{rank}(B) = 4 = n$, applying Corollary 4 yields

$$G = \text{const} \cdot Q^{y_1} P^{y_2} V^{y_3} \sigma^{2y_4} \tag{13}$$

for some constant const$> 0$, where $y = (y_1, y_2, y_3, y_4)^\top$ is the unique solution of the linear system $By = a$ which is given by $y = (0.5, 0, -0.5, 0.5)^\top$. □

Theorem 6 implies the well known *square-root law* for market impact. We would like to highlight that the present derivation of the square-root law does not rely on economic, empirical or theoretical assumptions except the dependence of $G$ on $Q, P, V$ and $\sigma^2$ as well as leverage neutrality. Donier et al. [8] present an alternative derivation of the square-root law relying on partial differential equations.

As discussed above, Kyle and Obizheava [15] consider yet another variable to influence the market impact, namely the fixed inventory cost $C$ leading to the weaker Assumption 3. An economic motivation to include $C$ in the analysis is provided also in [16]. Based on Assumption 3, Kyle and Obizheava [15] derive a more general result summarized in Theorem 2. The methodology of Section 3 can be employed to prove a similar result stated below.

First of all, the matrix $B$ used in the proof of Theorem 6 is extended by one column, which corresponds to $C$, to obtain the matrix

$$K = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & -1 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & -1 & -1 & 0 \\ 0 & -1 & 0 & 2 & 0 \end{pmatrix}. \tag{14}$$

The vector $a = (0, 0, 0, 1)^\top$ defined in (12) remains unchanged. Table 1 summarizes how $K$ and $a$ can be derived and should be read as follows: Assume the measurement of dimension $\mathbb{S}$ referring to the unit of shares changes by a factor $S$, then $Q$ changes by a factor $S$, $P$ changes

by a factor $S^{-1}$, $V$ changes by a factor $S$, $\sigma^2$ and $C$ do not change as $S^0 = 1$. Likewise, the last row labelled by $\mathbb{M}$ indicates that if the stock's leverage changes by a factor $A$, $Q$ does not change, $P$ changes by a factor $A^{-1}$, and so on.

Let us now compute the solution space $\mathcal{H}$ of the homogeneous system $Kx = 0$, which is given by the kernel of the linear map induced by $K$, as well as the solution space $\mathcal{I}$ of the inhomogeneous system $Ky = a$:

$$\mathcal{H} = \left\{ \lambda \begin{pmatrix} 3 \\ 2 \\ -1 \\ 1 \\ -2 \end{pmatrix}, \lambda \in \mathbb{R} \right\} \quad \text{and} \quad \mathcal{I} = \left\{ \begin{pmatrix} -1 \\ -1 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 1 \end{pmatrix} + \lambda \begin{pmatrix} 3 \\ 2 \\ -1 \\ 1 \\ -2 \end{pmatrix}, \lambda \in \mathbb{R} \right\}. \tag{15}$$

**Theorem 7.** *Suppose Assumptions 3 and 5 hold. Fix $x = (x_1, \dots, x_5)^\top \in \mathcal{H}$ and $y = (y_1, \dots, y_5)^\top \in \mathcal{I}$. There is a function $f : \mathbb{R}_+ \to \mathbb{R}_+$ such that*

$$G = Q^{y_1} P^{y_2} V^{y_3} \sigma^{2y_4} C^{y_5} f\left(Q^{x_1} P^{x_2} V^{x_3} \sigma^{2x_4} C^{x_5}\right). \tag{16}$$

*For example, setting*

$$x = \left(1, \frac{2}{3}, -\frac{1}{3}, \frac{1}{3}, -\frac{2}{3}\right)^\top \in \mathcal{H} \qquad \text{and} \qquad y = \left(0, -\frac{1}{3}, -\frac{1}{3}, \frac{1}{3}, \frac{1}{3}\right)^\top \in \mathcal{I},$$

*we obtain*

$$\begin{aligned} G &= \left(\frac{\sigma^2 C}{PV}\right)^{1/3} f\left(\left(\frac{Q^3 P^2 \sigma^2}{VC^2}\right)^{1/3}\right) \\ &= \frac{1}{L} f(Z), \end{aligned} \tag{17}$$

*where $L$ and $Z$ are defined in* (8).

*Proof.* Combining Assumptions 3 and 5 with the dimensions of $Q, P, V$, $\sigma^2$ and $C$ introduced in Section 1, we recover the matrix $K$ and the vector $a$ given in (14). Since Assumption 4 is satisfied and $\operatorname{rank}(K) = 4$, applying Corollary 5 completes the proof. □

**Remark 1.** *It is rather obvious from a financial point of view that the function $f : \mathbb{R}_+ \to \mathbb{R}_+$ should be* monotonically non-decreasing*, by considering the variable $Q$ while keeping the others constant. Likewise, from a financial perspective it seems reasonable to require $f$ to be continuous.*

Fixing $x$ and $y$ as in Theorem 7, different choices of $f$ in Equation (17) lead to some particularly relevant market impact models studied in the literature.

(a) The proportional price impact: $f \equiv \text{const}$ leads to

$$G = \text{const} \cdot \left(\frac{\sigma^2 C}{PV}\right)^{1/3}.$$

(b) The square-root impact: $f(z) = \text{const} \cdot z^{1/2}$ leads to

$$G = \text{const} \cdot \sigma \sqrt{\frac{Q}{V}}.$$

(c) The linear price impact: $f(z) = \text{const} \cdot z$ leads to

$$G = \text{const} \cdot Q \left( \frac{\sigma^4 P}{CV^2} \right)^{1/3}.$$

Kyle and Obizhaeva [15] also point out that these models are coherent with different functional forms for $f$ in (17), namely $f(z) = z^p$, so that (a), (b) and (c) arise from setting (a) $p = 0$, (b) $p = 1/2$ and (c) $p = 1$. It should be noticed that restricting the functional form of $f$ to $f(z) = z^p$ coincides with replacing the general function $g$ in Assumption 3 with a function taking the form of the *ansatz* (2) mentioned in the introduction in the context of the pendulum.

Alternatively, the price impact models (a), (b) and (c) can also be recovered by choosing the vectors $x \in \mathcal{H}$ and $y \in \mathcal{I}$ from Equation (16) appropriately. In more detail, setting $x = (0, 0, 0, 0, 0)^\top$ implies that $f\left(Q^{x_1} P^{x_2} V^{x_3} \sigma^{2x_4} C^{x_5}\right)$ from (16) reduces to a constant, so that choosing

$$\begin{aligned}
&\text{(a)} \quad y = \left(0, -\frac{1}{3}, -\frac{1}{3}, \frac{1}{3}, \frac{1}{3}\right)^\top \in \mathcal{I}, \\
&\text{(c)} \quad y = \left(\frac{1}{2}, 0, -\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}, 0\right)^\top \in \mathcal{I}, \\
&\text{(b)} \quad y = \left(1, \frac{1}{3}, -\frac{2}{3}, \frac{2}{3}, -\frac{1}{3}\right)^\top \in \mathcal{I},
\end{aligned}$$

results in the respective models (a), (b) and (c).

# 5. Conclusion

The main contribution of this manuscript is a novel derivation of the *square-root law* for market impact. The strong empirical support in favor of this *law* provides it with a universal character. Inspiring for our work, Kyle and Obizhaeva [15] derive a general form for the market impact function relying on dimensional analysis as well as the concepts of leverage neutrality and market microstructure invariance, where the *square-root law* turns out to be a special case of their result. Complementary to their approach, we present a direct and simple derivation of the *square-root law* requiring only two assumptions: Firstly, the market impact of a given meta-order *only* depends on its size, the corresponding stock price, the trading volume in the stock as well as its volatility. Secondly, we employ the concept of leverage neutrality as in [15]. This idea can be traced back to the Modigliani-Miller theorem [18] and explains how the considered quantities behave when leveraging a firm's debt-equity ratio. Relying on these plausible assumptions, we apply dimensional analysis in a rigorous way to show that the market impact of a meta-order is proportional to the volatility as well as to the square-root of this order's size and inversely proportional to the trading volume.

In the setting of Theorem 1, somehow surprisingly, the market impact does not depend on the stock price, although – a priori – the price is included in our analysis. There is a simple explanation: the stock price is the only quantity in our analysis measured in units of money. Hence it cannot play a role in the market impact as this dimensionless quantity does not involve the "dimension" money. In Appendix A we give a more detailed discussion of this argument in the form of an analogy to the case of the pendulum.

If we follow [15] and include an "inventory cost" into the set of quantities under investigation, we cannot uniquely determine a functional form for the market impact anymore (see Theorem 7). Rather we can precisely characterize its general form.

# A. The pendulum

We want to illustrate the difference between Theorem 1 and 2 by presenting its analogues in the context of the pendulum mentioned at the very beginning of this paper.

Consider a pendulum with length $l$ (measured in meters), mass $m$ (measured in grams) and period (measured in seconds). Assume that the period depends only on $l, m$ and the acceleration $g$ of gravity (measured in meters per seconds squared). That is, there is a function $f : \mathbb{R}_+^3 \to \mathbb{R}_+$ such that

$$p = \text{period} = f(l, m, g).$$

From Table 2, we get the matrices

$$D = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & -2 \end{pmatrix} \quad \text{and} \quad c = \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ 0 \\ 1 \end{pmatrix}$$

which represent the dimensions of the quantities $(l, m, g)$ and the period $p$ respectively in the unit system meter, gram and seconds. As $D$ is of full rank, it follows from Corollary 4 that

$$\text{period} = \text{const} \cdot l^{y_1} m^{y_2} g^{y_3} \tag{18}$$

for some const $> 0$, where the unique solution of the linear system $Dy = c$ is given by $y = (0.5, 0, -0.5)^\top$. Thus,

$$\text{period} = \text{const} \cdot \sqrt{\frac{l}{g}}. \tag{19}$$

The crucial assumption in the reasoning above is that the period of the pendulum is completely determined by its length, its mass and the acceleration due to gravity. However, it is conceivable that the period also depends on other variables, e.g. the amplitude $a$ (measured in meters) of the observed swing. In other words, we might also start from the weaker assumption

$$\text{period} = h(l, m, g, a). \tag{20}$$

The matrix containing the dimensions of the observed quantities is now given by

$$\widetilde{D} = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 1 & 1 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & -2 & 0 \end{pmatrix}.$$

It follows from Corollary 5 that the general form of the relation (20) is given by

$$\text{period} = l^{y_1} m^{y_2} g^{y_3} a^{y_4} \tilde{h}(l^{x_1} m^{x_2} g^{x_3} a^{x_4})$$

for some function $\tilde{h} : \mathbb{R}_+ \to \mathbb{R}_+$, where $x = (x_1, x_2, x_3, x_4)$ is a solution of the system $\widetilde{D}x = 0$ and $y = (y_1, y_2, y_3, y_4)$ a solution of the system $\widetilde{D}y = c$. Thus,

$$\text{period} = l^{y_1} g^{-1/2} a^{1/2 - y_1} \tilde{h}(l^{x_1} a^{x_1}) \tag{21}$$

| | $l$ | $m$ | $g$ | $a$ | period |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| lenght | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| mass | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| time | 0 | 0 | -2 | 0 | 1 |

Table 2: A labelled overview of the matrix summarizing the dimension of the quantities considered to determine the period of a pendulum.

for some $y_1, x_1 \in \mathbb{R}$ corresponding to the solutions $x, y$ of the above linear systems. The solution depends on one degree of freedom involved in the choice of $x_1$ and $y_1$. This is in contrast to the solution (18) above, where we simply had $x_1 = 0$ and $y_1 = \frac{1}{2}$. In the setting (20), dimensional analysis is not able to determine how the degree of freedom should be used to fix the choice of $x_1$ and $y_1$. We need some additional information. In physics we have the possibility of experiments. Already Galileo noticed the – at first glance surprising – experimental result that the period of the pendulum does *not* depend on the amplitude at least, in first order approximation. Using this insight from experimental physics, we conclude that we must have $x_1 = 0$ and $y_1 = 0.5$, i.e. the only physically relevant solution of the general solution (21) is given by

$$f(l, m, g) = \text{const} \cdot l^{1/2} g^{-1/2}, \tag{22}$$

so that we are back to (19).

Let us make the analogy to the case of Theorems 1 and 2 above. Dimensional analysis alone cannot decide whether the special solution given by Theorem 1 is the "true" relation between the market impact and the relevant variables, or whether some other solutions provided by Theorem 2 yields the "true" relation. To answer this question one has to take recourse either to economic theory or to empirical analysis. This is analogous to the above discussed situation of the pendulum where *physical experiments* yields that the special case (22) of the more general solution (21) is in fact the"true" relation (as long as the amplitude remains within reasonable bounds).

We conclude this discussion by observing that the question whether the solution (11) is the "true" relation among the more general candidates given by (16) is tantamount to saying whether the market impact actually depends – ceteris paribus – on the price of the stock in (6). In the setting of Theorem 2, fix the quantities $Q$, $V$ $\sigma^2$ and $C$. Varying the price $P$ of the stock then corresponds to varying the size, i.e. the market capitalization of the company, while leaving everything else unchanged. The above question then boils down to the question whether this variation of size of the company should have an effect on the relative market impact of the meta-order or not.

## B. Proof of Pi-Theorem

**Proof of Theorem 3:** We pass to logarithmic coordinates by using the following notation: given $Z \in \mathbb{R}_+$ we shall write $\widetilde{Z}$ for $\widetilde{Z} = \log(Z)$. On the logarithm scale $\widetilde{U}$ satisfies

$$\widetilde{U} = g\left(\widetilde{W}_1, \ldots, \widetilde{W}_n\right) \tag{23}$$

for some function $g : \mathbb{R}^n \to \mathbb{R}$.

If the left and the right hand sides of (23) do not depend on $L_1$, then it is sufficient to work with the units $(L_2, \ldots, L_m)$. On the other hand, if $a_1 \neq 0$ and $b_{11} = \cdots = b_{1n} = 0$ then $g \equiv 0$. If there exists $i \in \{1, \ldots, n\}$ such that $b_{1i} \neq 0$, we assume without loss of generality that $b_{11} \neq 0$. Putting $\widetilde{V} := -\frac{a_1}{b_{11}}\widetilde{W}_1 + \widetilde{U}$ and $\widetilde{X}_{i-1} := -\frac{b_{1i}}{b_{11}}\widetilde{W}_1 + \widetilde{W}_i$, $i = 2, \ldots, n$ we have

$$\begin{aligned}\widetilde{V} &= -\frac{a_1}{b_{11}}\widetilde{W}_1 + g\left(\widetilde{W}_1, \frac{b_{1i}}{b_{11}}\widetilde{W}_1 + \widetilde{X}_1, \ldots, \frac{b_{1n}}{b_{11}}\widetilde{W}_1 + \widetilde{X}_{n-1}\right)\\ &= f\left(\widetilde{W}_1, \widetilde{X}_1, \ldots, \widetilde{X}_{n-1}\right),\end{aligned}$$

for some function $f$. Let $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$ and put $L_1^* := e^{\lambda} L_1$. Since the dimensions of $\widetilde{V}$ and $\widetilde{X}_{i-1}$, $i = 2, \ldots, n$ are given in terms of the units $(L_1, \ldots, L_m)$, the quantities $\widetilde{V}, \widetilde{X}_1, \ldots, \widetilde{X}_{n-1}$ remain unchanged upon passing to the system of units $(L_1^*, L_2, \ldots L_m)$. On the other hand, $\log([W_1]) = -\lambda b_{11} + b_{11}\widetilde{L}_1^* + \sum_{i=2}^m b_{i1}\widetilde{L}_i$ so that in the system of units $(L_1^*, L_2, \ldots, L_m)$ it holds

$$\widetilde{V} = f\left(\lambda b_{11} + \widetilde{W}_1, \widetilde{X}_1, \ldots, \widetilde{X}_{n-1}\right).$$

Since $\lambda$ was taken arbitrary, $f$ does not depend on the first component, that is,

$$\widetilde{V} = f\left(\widetilde{X}_1, \ldots, \widetilde{X}_{n-1}\right). \tag{24}$$

By repeating the argument $\operatorname{rank}(B) - 1$ times, we obtain

$$\widetilde{U} - \sum_{j=1}^n y_j \widetilde{W}_j = h\left(\sum_{j=1}^n x_{1j}\widetilde{W}_j, \ldots, \sum_{j=1}^n x_{kj}\widetilde{W}_j\right),$$

where $k := n - \operatorname{rank}(B)$ and $x^{(i)} := (x_{i1}, \ldots, x_{in})^\top$ satisfies $x_{i(k+i)} = 1$ and $x_{i(k+j)} = 0$ for $j \in \{1, \ldots, k\} \setminus \{i\}$ for all $i = 1, \ldots, k$. Thus, $x^{(i)}$ are linearly independent. Notice that by construction $\sum_{j=1}^n x_{ij}\widetilde{W}_j$ for $i = 1, \ldots, k$ as well as $\widetilde{U} - \sum_{j=1}^n y_j \widetilde{W}_j$ are dimensionless. Therefore, $x^{(i)} \in \ker(B)$ and $y$ is the solution of the inhomogeneous system $By = a$. Hence, there is a function $F : \mathbb{R}^k \to \mathbb{R}_+$ such that

$$U W_1^{-y_1} \cdots W_n^{-y_n} = F(\pi_1, \ldots, \pi_n) \tag{25}$$

with $\pi_j := W_1^{x_{1j}} \cdots W_n^{x_{nj}}$, $j = 1, \ldots, k$. □

**Proof of Corollary 4:** First notice that if $k = 0$ then $n = \operatorname{rank}(B)$. Repeating the argument leading to (24) $\operatorname{rank}(B) - 2$ times, we can find $(z_1, \ldots, z_{n-1}) \in \mathbb{R}^{n-1}$, a quantity $X$ with dimension $[X] = L_m^{\alpha_m}$ and a function $f : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$ such that

$$\widetilde{Y} := \widetilde{U} - \sum_{j=1}^{n-1} z_j \widetilde{W}_j = f(\widetilde{X}).$$

Let us denote by $L_m^{c_m}$ the dimension of $Y$. We can assume without loss of generality that $\alpha_m \neq 0$. As in the proof of Theorem 3, we have

$$\widetilde{V} := \widetilde{U} - \sum_{j=1}^{n-1} z_j \widetilde{W}_j - \frac{c_m}{\alpha_m} X = -\frac{c_m}{\alpha_m} X + f(\widetilde{X}) = g(\widetilde{X}).$$

for some function $g$. Let $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$ and put $L_m^* = e^\lambda L_m$. Since $\widetilde{V}$ is dimensionless, its value does not change when passing to the unit $L_m^*$. On the other hand, $\log([X]) = -\alpha_m \lambda + \alpha_m L_m^*$. Hence, with respect to the unit $L_m^*$ we have

$$\widetilde{V} = g(\alpha_m \lambda + X).$$

Since $\lambda$ was taken arbitrary, the function $g$ must be a constant. Thus, there is const $> 0$ and $y = (y_1, \ldots, y_n) \in \mathbb{R}^n$ such that $U = \text{const} \cdot W_1^{y_1} \cdots W_n^{y_n}$. Since the right hand side of the latter equation has the dimension of $U$, we have $By = a$. □

**Proof of Corollary 5:** The result follows from a direct application of Theorem 3. □

# References


[1] R. Almgren, C. Thum, E. Hauptmann, and H. Li. Direct estimation of equity market impact. *Risk*, 18:57–62, 2005.

[2] E. Bacry, A. Iuga, M. Lasnier, and C.-A. Lehalle. Market impacts and the life cycle of investors orders. *Market Microstructure and Liquidity*, 01(02):1550009, 2015.

[3] N. Bershova and D. Rakhlin. The non-linear market impact of large trades: evidence from buy-side order flow. *Quantitative Finance*, 13(11):1759–1778, 2013.

[4] G. Bluman and S. Kumei. *Symmetries and differential equations*, volume 154. Springer Science & Business Media, 2013.

[5] J.-P. Bouchaud, J. D. Farmer, and F. Lillo. How markets slowly digest changes in supply and demand. In T. Hens and K. Schenk-Hoppé, editors, *Hanbook of Financial Markets: Dynamics and Evolution*, pages 57–156. Elsevier, Academic Press, Amsterdam, 2009.

[6] X. Brokmann, E. Sérié, J. Kockelkoren, and J.-P. Bouchaud. Slow decay of impact in equity markets. *Market Microstructure and Liquidity*, 01(02):1550007, 2015.

[7] W. Curtis, J. D. Logan, and W. Parker. Dimensional analysis and the pi theorem. *Linear Algebra and its Applications*, 47:117–126, 1982.

[8] J. Donier, J. Bonart, I. Mastromatteo, and J.-P. Bouchaud. A fully consistent, minimal model for non-linear market impact. *Quantitative Finance*, 15(7):1109–1121, 2015.

[9] R. Engle, R. Ferstenberg, and J. Russell. Measuring and modeling execution cost and risk. *The Journal of Portfolio Management*, 38(2):14–28, 2012.

[10] T. Foucault, M. Pagano, A. Roell, and A. Röell. *Market liquidity: theory, evidence, and policy*. Oxford University Press, 2013.

[11] X. Gabaix, P. Gopikrishnan, V. Plerou, and H. E. Stanley. Institutional investors and stock market volatility. *The Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 121(2):461–504, 2006.

[12] C. Gomes and H. Waelbroeck. Is market impact a measure of the information value of trades? Market response to liquidity vs. informed metaorders. *Quantitative Finance*, 15(5):773–793, 2015.

[13] H. E. Huntley. *Dimensional analysis*. Dover Publications, New York, 1967.

[14] A. S. Kyle. Continuous auctions and insider trading. *Econometrica: Journal of the Econometric Society*, pages 1315–1335, 1985.

[15] A. S. Kyle and A. A. Obizhaeva. Dimensional analysis and market microstructure invariance. *Available at SSRN 2785559*, 2016.

[16] A. S. Kyle and A. A. Obizhaeva. Market microstructure invariance: A dynamic equilibrium model. *Available at SSRN*, 2016.

[17] I. Mastromatteo, B. Toth, and J.-P. Bouchaud. Agent-based models for latent liquidity and concave price impact. *Physical Review E*, 89(4):042805, 2014.

[18] F. Modigliani and M. H. Miller. The cost of capital, corporation finance and the theory of investment. *The American economic review*, 48(3):261–297, 1958.

[19] E. Moro, J. Vicente, L. G. Moyano, A. Gerig, J. D. Farmer, G. Vaglica, F. Lillo, and R. N. Mantegna. Market impact and trading profile of hidden orders in stock markets. *Physical Review E*, 80(6):066102, 2009.

[20] B. E. Pobedrya and D. V. Georgievskii. On the proof of the $\pi$-theorem in dimension theory. *Russian Journal of Mathematical Physics*, 13(4):431–437, 2006.

[21] B. Tóth, Y. Lempérière, C. Deremble, J. de Lataillade, J. Kockelkoren, and J.-P. Bouchaud. Anomalous price impact and the critical nature of liquidity in financial markets. *Physical Review X*, 1(2):021006, 2011.

[22] E. Zarinelli, M. Treccani, J. D. Farmer, and F. Lillo. Beyond the square root: Evidence for logarithmic dependence of market impact on size and participation rate. *Market Microstructure and Liquidity*, 01(02):1550004, 2015.